

**Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the final office action dated January 25, 2005 and is due on or before April 25, 2005.

In regard to Ebner (US 5,788,176) under which Claims 29, 30, 34 and 36 were rejected as obvious, Ebner teaches the use of a load-bearing frame 10. Clearly, his frame is metal by his choice of the phase "load bearing," the uniform sectioning of the cross-sectional views and state of the art at the time of Ebner's invention. Clearly the Examiner is correct in that various parts of a frame can accommodate plastic parts but Ebner does not teach a frame which consists or substantially consists of resin.

The use of a plastic frame is not just the substitution of plastic for metal; the combination of a plastic frame with the use of a load-limiting device such as a torsion bar is a revolutionary combination.

Applicant respectfully believes he has also addressed the §112 rejections. Applicant has canceled a number of claims, such cancellations are without prejudice.

In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully urged that the present application be reconsidered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

*Markell Seitzman*  
Markell Seitzman  
Reg. No. 28,756

(586) 726-3905  
(586) 726-4172 (fax)